Travel & Expense Management System Project
User Group Requirements Work Sessions Parking Lot
As of 11/8/05

ID #	Status	Date Entered	Description	References & Comments
PL003	Open	9/23/05	What is the requirement around keeping pre-approval requests that are inactivated?	R3.07.003. Perhaps the request will be made in the future and the traveler could just re-activate the original request rather than create a new one. Refer to R3.17 (Larry) 10/3/05
PL006	Open	9/28/05	On 3.06 "Transfer Profile Information" Cinda had made a note that discussion had taken place about if the employees voucher information would go with them or stay with the old agency. The requirement just has "profile", so I am curious if the voucher information was also added to this, or if 3.06 is still "just" the profile information.	From Angie at L&I. See PL086 (same)
PL018	Open	10/11/05	R3.08.016. What happens if the approval is not given? What if there is nothing in the system that shows there was a prior approval for this? Is getting this requirement a "must"? Can approval be given at this point if there is no prior approval?	How does 3.08.003 relate to this? Does 3.08.003 address this? (Glen 10/12/05)
PL024	Open	10/11/05	R3.09.***. New. System will prevent certain designated travelers from receiving an advance. This might apply if the person has any travel advances that have not cleared (?) yet. If the person is specifically designated by the system admins (of fiscal?) not to get an advance. Check the OFM requirements.	Check with SWA on policy and policy implications. (Glen 10/12/05)
PL033	Open	10/11/05	R3.10.009. What does this requirement really mean as written?	Could be an audit issue. (Glen 11/10/05)

PL036	Open	10/18/05	R3.09.001, R3.09.011, R3.09.012 Define the specific fields used in pre-payment requests	Do this via linking to a data model that lays out the various fields used for pre-payment and other functions. (Glen 10/18/05)
PL039	Open	10/18/05	R3.10.010. The User Group recommended deleting this requirement.	The OFM TEMS Team had reservations about deleting the item. What if the preparer or traveler needed to decrease the amount after the voucher was submitted? Perhaps they would be accounting for things paid for on a corporate credit card. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL042	Open	10/18/05	What is a "trip"? Is the concept of "trip" one that should be considered or included in the new product? Are there reporting needs for trip information?	Issue for consideration as we look to incorporate Roadmap ideas into TEMS. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL052	Open	10/18/05	The system needs a way to determine if receipts have been obtained.	This is a rule by the IRS. If the receipts have not been obtained at a crucial point, should payment then be denied? Receipts are handled differently agency by agency. Check with SWA for guidance. (Glen 10/20/05)
PL056	Open	10/25/05	R3.11.017 thru R3.11.019. There are issues around deploying this.	The requirement is sound. What are the issues around how this will be done? (Glen 11/10/05)
PL057	Open	10/25/05	Show the data model to the User Group.	
PL067	Open	10/25/05	Is the concept of "trip" a requirement?	Same as PL042? (Glen 11/10/05)
PL080	Open	11/1/05	R3.16.001. New. Need similar policy requirements for pre-approval, advance, and expenses.	Do not include the list in the requirement itself. That locks us in to that specific set. Create a Business Rule for each set of requirements (reimbursement, pre-approval, advance, and expense). Refer to the Business Rule in the requirement. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL081	Open	11/1/05	When a business rule or policy sets criteria and the criteria threshold is reached, notification is sent to the user. This is true at all points of the system. Need a general requirement that handles this.	Policy issues. Need to be considered along with the approach to Roadmap recommendations. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL082	Open	11/1/05	If a business rule or policy sets criteria and the criteria threshold is passed, the system gives the user notification. Sometimes the user can override the threshold and continue on.	Policy issues. Need to be considered along with the approach to Roadmap recommendations. (Glen 11/10/05)

			Sometimes the user is stopped and is not permitted to override the threshold.	
PL083	Open	11/1/05	R3.17.001. Use the suggested change that's in the requirement.	
PL084	Open	11/1/05	R3.17… System has capability to handle multiple roles and multiple capabilities within the roles.	The current roles in the process are preparer, requestor, approver, fiscal user, agency administrator, and system administrator. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL085	Open	11/1/05	R3.17.004. Activate and inactivate a userid. Accommodate switching agencies and leaving government. A user should have their current agency as a data element profiling the user.	Relates to the HRMS interface. Once HRMS is active, we can explore an automated interface to add, inactivate, activate, and switch users between agencies. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL086	Open	11/1/05	New. What sorts of archiving capability should the system have? Perhaps the agency administrator has the ability to archive information that is older than a specified time.	See PL006 (same) Relates to records retention. How do we address archiving and meeting records retention standards? (Glen 11/10/05)
PL088	Open	11/1/05	R3.17.004. Move the requirement itself to some other section.	The requirement, as stated, talks about preventing a transaction from being deleted once it has been routed by the requestor or preparer. This probably should go into another section, if it isn't covered already. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL089	Open	11/1/05	R3.18… Requirement is "ability to communicate with a travel reservation system."	We do not want to build our own travel reservation system. We want to interface with an existing one. Need to be considered along with the approach to Roadmap recommendations. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL090	Open	11/8/05	R3.11.022. Are there any other flags or notifications that should be address in this way? Maybe this requirement should be more general?	
PL091	Open	11/8/05	R3.11.022. Is this only for rates that are known to the system?	Logically, it would be rates that are available to the system in one form or the other. (Glen) 11/10/05.
PL092	Open	11/8/05	R3.13.016. Provide counters to see how many vouchers are in the various queues. Status on the state of the vouchers (e.g., # in for approval, # in for payment).	
PL093	Open	11/8/05	There is a report need to track turnaround time.	

			How long does it take a voucher to make the flow?	
PL094	Open	11/8/05	New. Once a request has been approved, a preparer / requestor cannot pull back a voucher to add additional information.	
PL095	Open	11/8/05	R3.08.003. The system must indicate if pre-approval is given for a request.	The implementation of this could be a box indicating pre-approval was given. Could be a carry over from the pre-approval process. Would need information to justify exceptions. Need to provide the criteria for making a decision around the authorizing of the trip. The system must need to operate without pre-authorization for some instances, but needs to gather the reasons for the exceptions. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL096	Open	11/8/05	R3.10.003. Some agencies won't want preparers and requestors to do account coding. Only the fiscal shops should do account coding. Others will be more open to having requestors do account coding.	
PL097	Open	11/8/05	Should the system allow default account coding based on the user's profiles?	Sounded like there was consensus on OKMOD if the coding could be available in the profile. If there is no coding in the profile, then there would be no default account coding. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL098	Open	11/8/05	Can there be an auto-generated batch number. The agency could configure it for the starting number and the structure.	There is a lot of variation among agencies on an auto-generated batch number. We have had this conversation often over the years. (Glen 11/10/05)
PL099	Open	11/8/05	Do overrides have some issues around roles? What are the issues around making changes to items that have already been approved?	
PL001	Closed	9/23/05	Reroute voucher to another approver if the approver the received the original routing is unavailable or out of the office for some period of time.	See PL002 Comments (Tom) Refer to R3.12.007 (Larry) 10/3/05 Created 3.12.014 (Larry) 10/28/2005
PL002	Closed	9/23/05	Reroute vouchers to a new approver if the approver who received the original routing is no	The DSHS representative mentioned the ability for an agency administrator to assign a delegate for a manager

			longer at the agency.	no longer there or on vacation to keep from having to search for and reroute all the vouchers that have possibly been bottlenecked by an absent manager. I think this is technically do-able but from a security aspect, can we assume the agency administrator would have authority to delegate a manager's authority for him? In the current system a manager is the only one that can delegate review and approve authority. If we allow this, we need to make sure that this action is logged so if the question is asked: Who delegated my authority to so and so, we could answer with admin x granted the authority to so and so on this time and date. I think this type of system logging should be thought about and applied in several situations. The logs should be available to be read by us and agency personnel as opposed to the current logging, which is put in a data table and never looked at by anyone unless they have direct access to the database. (Tom) Refer to R3.12.009 (Larry) 10/3/05 Created 3.12.014 (Larry) 10/28/2005
PL004	Closed	9/23/05	Never let a "preparer" be an approver of the same request.	We can look ahead in the requirements and make sure this is addressed in the approval process and then it can be removed from the parking lot. (Tom) Refer to R3.11.005 (Larry) 10/3/05 No Change. Also refer to PL050. Larry (10/21/2005)
PL005	Closed	9/23/05	What is the definition of "enterprise"?	From Kathy Rosmond: In the context of the Roadmap Project, "Enterprise" refers to state government as a whole, rather than an individual agency e.g., managing Washington State as a corporation rather than as a collection of individual agencies. (Glen) 10/10/05 Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL007	Closed	10/4/05	R3.07. Add a requirement. Need to know the method of ground transportation. Is it POV,	If some agencies want this and other don't, will this present issues for design and development? Glen

			state car, rental car, shuttle, other? What are the ground transportation costs?	(10/5/05) Created R3.07.016 Larry (10/7/2005) Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL008	Closed	10/4/05	R3.07. Add a requirement. Need to know the reason and purpose for the proposed trip.	Created R3.07.017 Larry (10/7/2005) Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL009	Closed	10/4/05	R3.07. Add a requirement. Need to know the itinerary and the content of the trip.	Created R3.07.018 Larry (10/7/2005) Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL010	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08. Add a requirement. Need to track all changes made to the voucher once it is submitted. This would include changes made by the approver, fiscal, the preparer, or the traveler. The tracking on the changes cannot be deleted.	Refer to R3.12.013 Larry (10/21/2005)
PL011	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08.001. Modify this requirement. Split it up. Separate preparer from approver from fiscal and from admin. Drop the paragraph on administrator abilities to change information. Create a new requirement around the last paragraph on adjustments.	Changed R3.08.001 Larry (10/7/2005) Created R3.08.025 and R3.08.026 Larry (10/7/2005) Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL012	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08.004. What does "cancel" mean? Does it mean "inactivate" or "delete"? Get glossary definitions of these terms and use them consistently in the requirements document.	Clarify this and check the rest of the requirements document for consistency. Glen (10/5/05) Cancel means inactivate. The request will not be deleted, but will be added to inactivated list. Larry (10/24/2005) Changed R3.08.004 Larry (10/24/2005) Changed R3.07.003 and R3.11.007 Larry (11/4/2005)
PL013	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08.004. Can travelers pull back their voucher before payment is made to add more items?	User Group discussion was leaning toward allowing the preparer to call back a voucher up until the time it is forwarded to fiscal. This means the system will need to know if the voucher has been sent to fiscal. A requirement would be that the voucher status will explicitly status whether it has been routed to fiscal for payment. Glen. (10/5/05)

PL014	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08.008. Clarify or add new requirement. The administrator designates preparers, who they prepare for, and whether they can submit vouchers for the person they prepare for.	Refer to 3.17.003 Larry (11/3/2005)
PL015	Closed	10/4/05	R3.08.010. Split the requirement into separate requirements for in-state and out-of-state.	The implementation of out-of-state may be more problematic than for instate. Need to consider the cost to implement out-of-state. Glen (10/5/05) Changed R3.08.010 Larry (10/7/2005) Created R3.08.027 Larry (10/7/2005) Reviewed with User Group on 10/11/05 andClosed. (Glen 10/11/05).
PL016	Closed	10/11/05	R3.07.016 covers ground transportation. Should we be including a similar requirement for estimated air transportation costs?	Do we cover this in other requirements? (Glen 10/11/05). Changed R3.07.016 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL017	Closed	10/11/05	R3.08.011. Work on the phrasing to clarify what we mean in this requirement.	Get Tom involved in the discussion (Glen 10/12/05) Changed R3.08.011 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL019	Closed	10/11/05	R3.08.018. Reporting for taxable meals and items for payroll? Should this item be moved to the reporting section?	R3.13.009 references this. Is the concern here having a report that fiscal can generate and use to key into Payroll? Is the concern having an automated interface that feeds Payroll? (Glen 10/12/05) No change. Kept in current section. Larry (11/3/2005)
PL020	Closed	10/11/05	R3.08.019. Add a requirement to accommodate the automatic generation of round trip miles.	Check R3.08.019. Already has round trip. Can this suffice or should round trip miles be a separate requirement? (Glen 10/12/05) Kept as is. Larry (10/13/2005)
PL021	Closed	10/11/05	R3.08.** The system must allow the preparer or traveler to indicate the meal was provided for. This may be covered under R3.08.001 item if we are to lay out the itinerary and content in more detail.	Created R3.08.028 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL022	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.001. Separate this requirement into multiple requirements for each role – preparer/traveler, fiscal, and approver.	Changed R3.09.001 Larry (10/13/2005) Created R3.09.011 and R3.09.012 Larry (10/13/2005)

PL023	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.002. Split this into in-state and out-of-state. Similar to what we did with R3.08.027.	Changed R3.09.002 Larry (10/17/2005) Created R3.09.013 Larry (10/17/2005)
PL025	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.003. New. When the voucher is reactivated, the voucher will display again and can be used.	Created R3.07.019, R3.08.029, and R3.09.016 Larry (11/3/2005)
PL026	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.004. Clean up the verbage. Notify the traveler if there is an overage. Allow the charge. Maybe split this one up.	Review R. 3.07.004 as well. (Glen 10/12/05) Changed requirement to read same as R3.07.004 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL027	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.005/006. These two should be covered if we add more detail to R3.09.001	Changed R3.09.001 (Added "View") Larry (10/13/2005) Added "View" to R3.09.011 and R3.09.012 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL028	Closed	10/11/05	Present an overview of the requirements that tie in pre-approval with pre-payment and with reimbursement. Give the User Group a feel for how those processes work together. We should have enough in the requirements to support the understanding of the flow and interrelationship. Some ties to R3.09.009.	Covered by the requirements flow analysis work in the Nov. 15 User Group.
PL029	Closed	10/11/05	R3.09.xxx. New. Agency can configure the system to determine the amount of advance. Fiscal user can designate a % of estimated expense as the allowable pre-payment.	Created R3.09.014 Larry (10/13/2005) Created R3.09.015 Larry (10/17/2005)
PL030	Closed	10/11/05	Issue. How to deal with 3rd party reimbursement. For example, someone pays for a state employee to give a presentation at a conference.	Include new requirement to accommodate adjustment features. (Glen 10/12/05) Created R3.10.019 Larry (10/13/2005)
PL031	Closed	10/11/05	R3.10.007. Issue. Don't specify AFRS. What is the benefit? Can this be more generic? What exactly does it do currently? What is the cost to set this capability up? If we have multiple output formats, then how much of this can we reasonably do? How does it address accessibility questions?	Combine 3.10.001 and 3.10.004 to eliminate the specific reference to AFRS. (Glen 10/12/05) Deleted R3.10.007 Larry (11/4/2005)
PL032	Closed	10/11/05	R3.10.008. Perhaps move this to the	See 3.10.008. This should stay in this section (Glen

			Reimbursement Request section?	10/12/05) The requirement should remain in Account Coding as it pertains to balance to code. Larry (10/17/2005)
PL034	Closed	10/11/05	R3.08.012 Reword requirement so that we are not using disabled employees to describe the requestor.	Requirement was put on "Delete" status during the 10/11/05 User Group Meeting. Deleting should close this Parking Lot item (Glen 10/14/05)
PL035	Closed	10/14/05	Be more exact when the requirements refer to "user". "User" means anyone that is setup on the system. Types of users are preparer, requestor, approver, fiscal, agency administrator, and system administrator.	Modified the requirements for clarity (Glen 10/14/05)
PL037	Closed	10/18/05	R3.10.012 thru R3.10.018. These requirements are specific to the TVS to AFRS interface. The requirement should be to provide information to external payables systems that the customers use.	Do this via linking to a set of interface requirements. The AFRS interface will have a set of requirements and a module designed and developed to support them. Other customers' payables systems will use different modules. (Glen 10/18/05)
PL038	Closed	10/18/05	R3.10.008. Why are we doing this? Include a comment to give the rationale why these subtotals are important and what is the use of them.	Helps fiscal staff code sub objects as well as balance to code. Larry (10/21/2005) Balance to code serves as a reconciliation between the voucher subtotals and account coding totals. Larry (10/24/2005)
PL040	Closed	10/18/05	Add a requirement for a configurable account coding block that can create an interface file that can be used by customer agencies as input to their payables system(s). The details of the interface into the payables system would be documented in the section on Interface Requirements within the Software Requirements Specification. There would be separate interfaces for each payables system that received an interface file.	Changed R3.10.003 Larry (11/4/2005) Created R3.10.020 Larry (11/4/2005)
PL041	Closed	10/18/05	The User Group identified some items that would probably go into the interface	These items will be considered as we begin more detailed requirements and get into the design for the interfaces.

			requirements section: • Edits specific to individual agency chart of accounts • Use of fiscal month • Batch numbers – which are probably modifiable agency by agency • Activity-based costing needs	
PL043	Closed	10/18/05	Should the product be able to designate specific project accounts to specific lines of expense on the voucher?	Could be covered by a configurable account code block.
PL044	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.002. Split this requirement. Consider combining the first half of the requirement with R3.11.004 (e.g., The System must allow multiple fiscal users the ability to review Closed payment requests. However, only one fiscal user can open a request for change or approval at a time.)	Changed R3.11.002 Larry (10/21/2005) Deleted R3.11.004 Larry (10/21/2005)
PL045	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.002. Create a new requirement for the 2nd half of this requirement. Split out the items the fiscal group can change.	Created R3.11.020 Larry (10/21/2005)
PL046	Closed	10/18/05	Develop a document that includes all the requirements related to the basic workflow of a request through approval and submission payment. See if we have included everything.	This is a bit like a high-level use case. It will be valuable to see if we are consistent throughout the process and if we have neglected to include some obvious requirements. (Glen 10/20/050) Covered by the requirements flow analysis work in the Nov. 15 User Group. (related to PL028)
PL047	Closed	10/18/05	Is the Payment Approval Function (R3.11) specific to the fiscal user activities only?	Should we break this section into sections for the approver and for the fiscal user? Then the approver Function would happen before the Account Coding – however, the requirements listing does not imply anything about sequence and should not be read as such. (Glen 10/20/05) The Payment Approval Function is not specific to fiscal approval, but to the entire approval process. Larry (10/21/2005)

PL048	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.002. When these items in the second half of the requirement are changed, we want to make sure we can see the history of changes.	Have we covered tracking changes in enough detail in the requirements? Check PL010. (Glen 10/20/05) Refer to R3.12.013 Larry (10/21/2005)
PL049	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.003. Delete this requirement. It is the default way every application works.	The developers feel this is the default case in every application on the market. Does not need to be stated. (Glen 10/20/05) User Group said to keep this in. DOT had an application that did not function this way. Be specific, even if it appears trivial.
PL050	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.005. This can generally be stated so that a person never is permitted to approve their own request at any level.	Check to see if this is already covered (e.g., in PL002). (Glen 10/20/05) No change. Above reference should be PL004. Larry (10/21/2005)
PL051	Closed	10/18/05	R3.11.006. There are two requirements here. One is to track the status of a request within TEMS. The other is the status of the request once a transaction representing the request has been sent to the payables system. If the payables can sent a message to TEMS, then the requirement is around the display of that message from the payables system.	Changed R3.11.006 Larry (10/21/2005) Created R3.11.021 Larry (10/21/2005)
PL053	Closed	10/25/05	Make sure we have documented every approval point we need in the requirements. Do not assume there is a global approval stated if it is not explicit.	Covered by the requirements flow analysis work in the Nov. 15 User Group. (related to PL028)
PL054	Closed	10/25/05	Review the requirements that fit into a process flow during the Nov. 8 session.	Covered by the requirements flow analysis work in the Nov. 15 User Group. (related to PL028)
PL055	Closed	10/25/05	R3.11.012. The rate will vary by agency.	Requirement previously changed. Changed ''exceeds'' to "differs" and deleted the word "classified". (Larry) 10/28/2005
PL058	Closed	10/25/05	R3.12.005. Who should the route back go to? The preparer or requestor? Is this covered under an earlier requirement? Should this be split into two requirements?	Changed R3.12.005 Larry (10/28/2005) Refer to PL073 Larry (11/3/2005)

PL059	Closed	10/25/05	R3.12.008. Delete the requirement. Create a new requirement for pulling back transactions once they are submitted for payment, but have not actually gone there.	Changed R3.12.008 Larry (10/28/2005) After fiscal has released a batch of transactions, they want an ability to pull the set of transactions back to make changes. This would have to be before it is sent to the accounting system. Once in the accounting system, fiscal would need to go there to deal with the changes.
PL060	Closed	10/25/05	The abilities to override actions and the security level(s) required are not specified in the requirements (at least not completely). Do an overview to see if they are covered sufficiently. Also consider security requirements in the non-functional requirements.	
PL061	Closed	10/25/05	R3.13.007 & R3.13.008. Separate REQ by role. Different priorities because of the roles.	Need to define at some point what to print (e.g., what filters to provide). Changed R3.13.005, 3.13.007, and 3.13.008 Larry (10/28/2005) Created 3.13.014 and 3.13.015 Larry (10/28/2005)
PL062	Closed	10/25/05	R3.13.009. System must have search and query capability on every (?) field. System must have role-based access for query capability.	Such as POV. Changed R3.13.009 Larry (10/28/2005)
PL063	Closed	10/25/05	Combine R3.13.009 and R3.13.010. The capability is the same regardless of the type of data.	Deleted R3.13.010 Larry. Covered by R3.13.009. (10/28/2005)
PL064	Closed	10/25/05	R3.13.012. Kick this requirement up a level.	Deleted R3.13.012, refer to R3.13.009 Larry (10/28/2005)
PL065	Closed	10/25/05	R3.13 – We can currently print different levels of detail of the voucher. This is handy. We can get small to large reports of a single voucher.	Refer to R3.13.001 Larry (10/28/2005) Refer to PL075 Larry (11/3/2005)
PL066	Closed	10/25/05	HOMEWORK: For Nov. 1 the User Group attendees are going to provide examples of reports that would be handy for them and their agency.	A couple User Group members had input on Nov. 1. This topic will be more extensively addressed later in the project as the team defines specific reports.
PL068 (A)	Closed	11/1/05	R3.12.014. New. Provide notification to the delegated approver that there are vouchers for	Created R3.12.015 Larry (11/2/2005)

			that person's review and approval when the agency administrator makes the delegation assignment.	
PL068 (B)	Closed	10/25/05	R3.14.003. Reword to something like "online help is configurable by agency".	Changed R3.14.003 Larry (10/28/2005)
PL069	Closed	11/1/05	R3.12.014. New. When an agency administrator makes a delegated approver assignment, notify the original approver of the delegation. This is provided the original approver is still with the agency.	No change Larry (11/2/2005)
PL070	Closed	11/1/05	R3.12.014. New. When a delegated approver makes an approval or denial on a request, notify the original approver of the approval or denial action. This is provided the original approver is still with the agency.	Created R3.12.016 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL071	Closed	11/1/05	R3.12.014. New. Only one person can have a voucher open to make an approval or denial at a time.	In the case of a designated approver, if both the approver and designated approver are trying to approve/deny the same voucher, only one person can have it open at a time. Created R3.12.017 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL072	Closed	11/1/05	R3.11.012. New. Notification flags to indicate certain conditions (e.g., requests over per diem) must be configurable by agency.	Some agencies would like some flags turned off so they do not confuse users. Created R3.11.022 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL073	Closed	11/1/05	R3.12.005. The e-mail notification should indicate which requestor is in question.	This is handy for preparers that do multiple requestors – so then they know who the various e-mails are for. No change to requirement (technical issue). Larry (11/4/2005)
PL074	Closed	11/1/05	R3.13.013 thru R3.13.015. New. Repeat these requirements for fiscal users.	Created R3.13.016, R3.13.017, and R3.13.018 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL075	Closed	11/1/05	R3.13.001. Need to be able to print variable amounts of data for an individual voucher.	Sometimes you want all the data from a voucher, sometimes you just want part of the data. Changed R3.13.001 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL076	Closed	11/1/05	R3.13.001. We need the ability to create reports and configure them at the agency level.	Created R3.13.019 Larry (11/2/2005)

PL077	Closed	11/1/05	R3.13.001. New. Provide a download capability. Users can request data and the system will perform a download to provide the data. The users can then put the data into the tool(s) of their choice.	Refer to R3.13.020. This capability exists in Enterprise Reporting. Larry (11/3/2005)
PL078	Closed	11/1/05	R3.13.001. New. Provide reports in electronic format and hard copy.	Sometimes 3rd parties request electronic copies of travel or expense transactions. Created 3.13.020 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL079	Closed	11/1/05	R3.15.001. Split. OFM will do a system wide notification. Agencies can do their own configurable notification.	Changed R3.15.001 Larry (11/2/2005) Created R3.15.002 Larry (11/2/2005)
PL087	Closed	11/1/05	Ability to change the user name without losing data associated with the old name.	Currently, agency administrators need to do some manipulation to accommodate a name change. It should be smoother. Refer to R3.04.001 and R3.04.004 Larry (11/7/2005)